DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 840 EA 006 197

AUTHOR Bettinghaus, Erwin P.
TITLE Preliminary Field Study: Dissemination of Educational Accountability. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Dept. of Education, Lansing.
SPONS AGENCY Colorado State Dept. of Education, Denver. Cooperative Accountability Project.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 48p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Educational Accountability; Educational Assessment; *Educational Experiments; Educational Research; *Information Dissemination; Models; *Program Evaluation

ABSTRACT

In 1973 the Michigan Department of Education and the Cooperative Accountability Project attempted to develop a greater understanding of the problems which might be associated with dissemination of information about educational accountability programs. From this project three papers resulted that outlined a potential dissemination model designed to be useful to local educators in communicating elements of any educational accountability model. The model was tested in 1974. This limited test was aimed at investigating the reactions of participants at the local level to attempt to train them to disseminate elements of the model. This report contains: (1) a brief statement of the project's accomplishments, (2) an evaluation of the project prepared by the project evaluator, (3) a budget analysis, (4) recommendations for future efforts in this area, and (5) an appendix containing the materials produced for the project. (Author/JF)

ED 091840

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JUL 8 1974
SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EA IR
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

FINAL REPORT

Preliminary Field Study: Dissemination of Educational Accountability

by

Erwin P. Bettinghaus

Michigan State University

A study sponsored by The Cooperative Accountability Project
Colorado Department of Education
1362 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

EA 006 197

INTRODUCTION

From January 1, 1973 to June 30, 1973, the Michigan Department of Education joined with the Cooperative Accountability Project, Denver, Colorado, in an attempt to develop a greater understanding of the problems which might be associated with dissemination of information about educational accountability programs. The Michigan Department of Education, under the overall supervision of Dr. Thomas Fisher, contracted with Dr. Erwin P. Bettinghaus and Gerald R. Miller, from Michigan State University, to produce a series of three papers entitled "A Dissemination System for State Educational Programs." Following the completion of the three major papers, a fourth paper, "Reactions and Authors' Comments on Reactions to the Papers Entitled 'A Dissemination System for State Accountability Programs'" was prepared during the period July 1, 1973 to September 1, 1973. This report summarizes the comments of three non-project reactors to the original three papers together with the comments of the two authors. Following the publication of these papers, and the reactors comments to the papers, a monograph was published by CAP which condensed the three part series so that it could be made available to a large audience.

The documents produced by Bettinghaus and Miller outlined a potential dissemination model designed to be useful to local educators in communicating elements of any educational accountability model. However, the model developed in the three part series of papers had never been tested in a specific local situation. Therefore, the Michigan Department of Education proposed to the Cooperative Accountability Project that a limited test of the model be

made during the period January 1, 1974 to March 30, 1974. This limited test was to be aimed at investigating the reactions of participants at the local level to attempts to train them to disseminate elements of the model developed by Bettinghaus and Miller.

This pilot training project is essentially complete. The only task yet remaining is to develop two training monographs which were identified as being potentially useful by the consultants. These monographs should be completed prior to April 30, 1974.

This Final Report contains (1) A brief statement of the project's accomplishments, (2) An evaluation of the project prepared by the project evaluator, Dr. Fisher, (3) A budget analysis, (4) recommendations for future efforts in this area, and (5) an appendix containing the materials produced for the project. No attempt will be made to review the PERT Chart for the project, since that task was completed in the two interim reports.

PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The dissemination model produced by Dr. Bettinghaus and Dr. Miller during 1973 was based on the identification of specific target audiences, and attempts to communicate with those audiences in ways which might appeal uniquely to them. The various elements of the dissemination model, while generally applicapable to the problems of dissemination of materials about educational accountability, had not been tested within a local school district setting. Thus the purpose of this project was to select a school district in Michigan, acquaint them with the principles of the dissemination model, and attempt to have them do some work with a selected target audience. No funds were provided to the local school district to assist them in this enterprise.

Following preliminary planning meetings (described in interim reports), the Gull Lake Michigan School District was selected. The district is semi-rural in nature, located within a few miles of Kalamazoo, Michigan, but having little industry, and no media serving the district directly. Its characteristics are much like thousands of districts across the country which are not located in the midst of a large city, but offer a K-12 range of education.

The Superintendent of the district was interested in dissemination of information about Michigan Assessment, particularly because he felt that many teachers and School Board members had an inadequate understanding of Michigan Assessment. The Superintendent expressed some interest in disseminating information to audiences of parents and taxpayers, but could not be convinced to make such attempts within the time frame covered by this pilot project. Therefore, dissemination efforts were confined to audiences of teachers and school board members.

The main effort of this pilot project was spent in developing and conducting three training sessions, and then holding a fourth training session where final questions could be answered, the results of the training could be assessed, and reinforcement of any concepts could be accomplished. As was described in the project logs appended to the interim reports, the project attempted to give each participant information and training in three areas: (1) A working knowledge of the dissemination system, (2) further essential information about Educational Accountability, with specific attention to the Michigan Assessment Data generated for that district, and (3) a working knowledge of evaluation techniques designed to help the participants in evaluating the results of their communication activities. These three objectives are described in more detail below:

Training for Dissemination

The dissemination model produced in the earlier CAP monograph stresses a number of elements deemed inappropriate to the Gull Lake School District Administrators. For example, the complete dissemination model stresses the use of the mass media to reach large numbers of parents and citizens. The Gull Lake superintendent did not wish to stress this aspect of the dissemination model at the present time. Therefore, this material was largely eliminated from the training sessions. Instead, the concentration was on training in those aspects of the dissemination model which stress interpersonal communication.

The major areas of information stressed in the communication training during the sessions included: (1) formulation of the communication objective, (2) determination of the communication setting, (3) identifying potential barriers to communication, (4) identifying potential audiences for communication, and (5) preparing dissemination messages.

During the first training session, it was discovered that a number of participants had difficulty in formulating communication objectives. Therefore, a "check-list" of steps necessary to successfully develop a communication objective was prepared, together with a work sheet. Although these materials are clearly not sufficient, they did seem to be of help to the participants as they attempted to formulate objectives for particular audiences. Appendix A contains an example of the "check-list" as well as a work sheet. Appendix B contains the work sheets as they were prepared by the participants.

Training in Accountability

Early in the training sessions, the consultants discovered that many of the participants were inadequately trained in elements of the Michigan Accountability Model, specifically Michigan Assessment Test data for their school and district. Although all participants had been exposed to some of the materials available from the Michigan Department of Education, they did not have some of the specific information about the most recent Michigan Assessment Test which would enable them to communicate accurately to others. Therefore, a portion of the second training session was devoted to training the participants in specific aspects of Michigan Assessment results as they applied to the Gull Lake District.

The major areas of information stressed in the portion of the second session devoted to Michigan Assessment included: (1) interpretation of the report forms generated by the Michigan Educational Assessment Program, (2) description of the relationship between the MEAP tests and the state's minimal objectives, (3) information on the relationship between MEAP test data and possible utilization of the data by local districts.

The success of this portion of the second training session was tested in two ways. First, specific questions relating to Michigan Assessment were asked in a written evaluation section following the final session (see evaluation section). Second, judgments were made as the result of viewing the materials each participant prepared for the audiences they were working with. The materials prepared were in the form of charts and graphs designed for use with the particular audiences the participant needed to communicate with. Unfortunately, the materials prepared were of such a size that it was impossible to reproduce them for inclusion in this report.

Training in Evaluation

One of the real problems in training individuals to be able to engage in dissemination activities is to give them information which will let them evaluate their own activities. The consultants decided to devote a portion of the second training session to training for evaluation. Although the consultants felt that more material on evaluation activities would have been helpful, the session was still deemed a success by the participants.

The major areas of information stressed in this portion of the second training session included: (1) a description of the relationship of evaluation to communication activities, (2) types of evaluation available for use in communication situations, and (3) components of the evaluation process.

As a result of experiences working with the evaluation component, the consultants decided that it would be helpful to have a short monograph on evaluation activities in similar situations. This has been proposed to CAP.

In brief form, therefore, the training sessions:

1. Gave the participants information about communication and the dissemination model.

2. Gave the participants further information about the Michigan Educational Assessment Program.

3. Gave the participants information about evaluation of communication activities.

PROJECT EVALUATION

Design of Evaluation

The original project proposal from the MDE to CAP was not complex and was heavily oriented toward a "process" type of evaluation as opposed to a

"product" type. Therefore, the proposal asked for certain checks to ascertain that progress was being made and that the project maintained its time schedule.

After beginning the project, this sketchy design was made somewhat more stringent--particularly in the area of specific things the consultants wanted to accomplish. The following data were, therefore, collected:

1) Process logs for each of the four training sessions and for one pre-project meeting in Gull Lake and for one planning session between Drs. Bettinghaus and Fisher;
2) Participant feedback forms completed after the first and second workshop sessions; (See Appendix C)
3) Participant feedback information collected after completion of the project; (See Appendix D)
4) A participant questionnaire or "test" of certain salient communication topics; (See Appendix D)
5) A participant questionnaire or "test" of certain skills related to the Michigan Educational Assessment Program; (See Appendix D)
6) Copies of participants' worksheets on communication objectives; and
7) Copies of the charts, graphs, etc. produced by some of the participants as they worked on their communication objectives.

Each process log was sent to CAP in the two interim evaluation reports. The other items have been included herein as APPENDIX items. The final two participant questionnaires were scored and are reported in the following section.

Analysis of Results

Each process log summarized the difficulties and successes of each of the four training sessions. Since these items were attached to the interim reports they will not be repeated here but will only be summarized.

1. The project staff met with some initial confusion when the participants did not understand the objectives of the project. This was overcome by the third meeting.
2. The project staff was unable to convince the local superintendent to attempt to compose and work on any dissemination steps with audiences other than the school board and teachers.
3. Some of the participants were not as well motivated as were others.
4. The consultants were too pressed for time and were not able to prepare all of the needed teaching aids which were needed.
5. The project staff did manage to interest the participants in thinking seriously about dissemination activities, but it is not known if this interest level will be sustained.
6. Most participants were not completely familiar with Michigan Assessment, and project staff had to spend more time than planned in achieving familiarity with Michigan Assessment.
7. The participants did indicate throughout the project that the consultants were doing an acceptable job of presenting the material.

8. The final open-ended survey (process-type) completed by the participants indicated that 1) the experience of the project had been worthwhile but 2) there was still some apprehension about their understanding of dissemination systems. (This is understandable since there really was only time enough during the four sessions to acquaint them with the theories.)

The two or three participants who attempted to design Audio-Visual aids for use in dissemination activities with the board and with selected teachers produced worthwhile efforts. However, the materials were somewhat crude and unpolished. This may be due to a lack of time to work on them, a lack of skill, a lack of materials, or a lack of interest. One might well assume that such efforts will be crude unless there is sufficient training and assistance for the communicator--in this case LEA administrators. During the next grant CAP period, the consultants will have to critically assess LEA capabilities in this regard.

Also included in Appendix C of this final report are the worksheets used by the participants to construct their communication objectives. As was mentioned in the Process Log for February 20, 1974, these objectives are not of particularly high quality. They reflect confusion on how to write such objectives in a clear and concise manner. This problem is probably related to the lack of sufficient time to teach such skills and to the lack of adequate training materials. Hopefully, the latter problem will be solved by the planned development of a brief monograph on the topic.

The final evaluation survey consisted of two different forms. The first form (see Appendix D) was composed of seven questions devoted to communication

theory and applications. It was designed to help determine if the project participants had learned certain major concepts essential to the dissemination model. The second form consisted of ten questions directly related to the data resulting from the 1973-74 Michigan Educational Assessment Program.

The questions on each form were scored by the project evaluator. In the case of the first form, the seven questions were scored on a 5 point scale. The scoring decisions were subjective and depend solely on the evaluator's judgement. The second survey was scored on a simple "right-wrong" basis and was not as subjective.

Distributions of the results of the survey on communication are shown in TABLE 1.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES ON COMMUNICATION SURVEY

Question	Scores				
	5	4	3	2	1
1	0	1	2	3	3
2	1	3	3	2	0
3	5	2	0	0	1
4	9	0	0	0	0
5	2	7	0	0	0
6	9	0	0	0	0
7	0	3	6	0	0

In viewing these data, it is clear that the lowest scores were obtained on questions 1, 2, and 7. These questions dealt with an understanding of communication objectives, interpersonal communication channels, and communication evaluation. The lowest scores were obtained on the first of the three.

This tends to confirm the consultants' feelings about their success in explaining communication objectives as was noted in an earlier Process Log. It also supports the need for additional teaching materials devoted to this topic.

Scoring of the second survey (on the Michigan Educational Assessment Program) resulted in seven people getting 100% of the questions right and two people getting 90% right. While this survey by no means exhausts the topic, it tends to confirm the consultants previous view that the participants were able to understand certain basic information being generated by the assessment program.

Summary

In summary, this project attempted to conduct a small, pilot training project in elements of the dissemination system developed during the previous CAP funding period. Success, then, depended upon elements of the training process and not upon the results of the dissemination efforts of the LEA participants.

With this in mind, the project seems to have been successful to a degree but not as successful as was originally desired. The chief reason for this was a lack of time to develop all of the necessary materials when they were needed most and a lack of teaching time to reinforce the participants' understandings and skills.

BUDGET ANALYSIS

The budget for this project was satisfactory. Of the allocated funds to the primary contractor, Dr. Bettinghaus, a total of $1105.00 was spent to complete the training phase and to complete the required reports. An additional total of $520.00 will be needed for preparation of the two proposed monographs. Thus, $375.00 will be returned to the contractor from the initial budget of $2000.00. The expenditures are less than the original projected figures because it was not found desirable to produce the elaborate training materials originally called for in the proposal.

A complete breakdown of expenses is shown below, divided by the two major project tasks:

Budget: Training

Dr. E.P. Bettinghaus:

Initial Planning sessions (2 half days)		1.0 dy	
Develop objectives, lesson plans		1.0 dy	
Conduct Sessions (4 half days)		2.0 dys	
Interim reports		.5 dy	
Final Report D		2.5 dys	
	Total	7 dys	700.00

Dr. R. Roth:

Needs analysis; planning		.5 dy	
Develop Objectives		.5 dy	
Conduct Sessions (4 half days)		2.0 dys	
	Total	3.0 dys	300.00

Other Expenses:

Secretarial		3 dys	60.00
Final Report: Materials, binding, mailing			45.00
	Total		$1105.00

Budget: Monograph

Dr. E.P. Bettinghaus:			
	Monograph on Communication Objectives	2.0 dys	
	Editing monograph on Evaluation	.5 dy	
	Total	2.5 dys	250.00
Dr. R. Roth:			
	Monographs on Evaluation	2.0 dys	200.00
Other:			
	Secretarial	2.0 dys	40.00
	Monograph Production:		30.00
	Total	6.5 dys	$520.00
	GRAND TOTAL		$1625.00

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTIVITIES

Several suggestions for change in our procedures appear in the interim reports filed earlier in the contract period. The evaluation section completed by Dr. Fisher also points to areas in which the training could be improved. This section will not specifically review each of those earlier recommendations. Rather, we shall concentrate on a series of general recommendations which might be used to improve further training efforts aimed at transmitting the dissemination model to local educational personnel.

1. Future training efforts must involve more total time in the training effort. This project involved four half days of actual contact with the participants. Of that time, only two half days actually involved the specific transference of new knowledge. The remainder of the time was taken up with evaluation efforts, practice in writing and reviewing communication objectives, and answering questions. It is not unreasonable to suggest that at least two full days are needed for training in the dissemination area alone, with additional time needed for evaluation efforts.

2. Future training efforts must begin from a solid base of knowledge about educational accountability. The goal of dissemination training is to be able to have local school district personnel competent to communicate about educational accountability with various types of audiences. A first requirement is that the school district personnel selected as communicators be thoroughly familiar with all elements of the accountability model to be used. As we have pointed before, the Gull Lake personnel had had some exposure to Michigan Assessment, but they were not thoroughly familiar with the details of Michigan Assessment, nor how the data for their school could be used to

assess the adequacy of certain aspects of the curriculum. Thus, future efforts at teaching communication about accountability should begin with efforts to teach the accountability model itself to those who will be responsible for dissemination.

3. Special attention must be given to the preparation of communication objectives. The participants in this project had significant difficulties in preparing clear, concise, communication objectives. To the extent that communication objectives form the heart of any system of instruction about dissemination, this step should be emphasized, utilizing all appropriate visual aids and practice sessions.

4. Some care must be taken to insure that each communicator within a district communicate the same "position" about accountability. In this pilot project, the participants included the superintendent, the director of curriculum, and the principals of each school in the system. Although there certainly will be very legitimate differences between what a high school principal communicates to his teachers, and what an elementary principal communicates to his, there should be close agreement on the attitudes that need to be communicated, and on the details to be communicated at each level. With this project, it was noted that different principals tended to communicate differently, and no efforts were made to insure any uniform communication tasks.

5. Funds need to be provided directly to the district to enable local school personnel to develop materials for use with various audiences. Most of the participants in the pilot study did an excellent job of attempting to communicate to their selected audience. Their task was made more difficult, however, because they did not have the opportunity to construct visual aids, nor to make use of any mass media techniques. While some of the participants

did try to make visuals, the lack of funds meant that only crude materials were constructed.

6. Future training efforts must involve districts that need to communicate to the general public. The original dissemination model developed by Bettinghaus and Miller involved communication to a number of potential audiences central to the school district personnel, i.e., teachers and school board members. To provide a complete test of the dissemination model will require efforts within a local district that is interested in providing information about educational accountability to audiences of parents and the general tax-paying public as well as audiences closely associated with the school system.

APPENDIX A

Communication Objective Check-List

and

Work Sheet

Disseminating Information About Educational Accountability

Formulating the Communication Objective

Clearly, one of the most important steps in disseminating information about assessment or accountability is the formulation of a clear communication objective or set of objectives. Below, we list a number of questions which any communicator ought to ask before he prepares a message.

Step I. Selecting and Defining a Target Audience

- A. Exactly what audience is to be the target of attention?
  - 1. The School Board?
  - 2. The Teaching Staff?
  - 3. Parents?
    - a. Of fourth and seventh grade children?
      Of children in other grades?
  - 4. The voting public?
- B. What is the probable size of the audience?
- C. What do we know about the probable knowledge level of the audience members?
- D. What do we know about the probable attitudes of the audience?
  - 1. Toward assessment?
  - 2. Toward accountability?
  - 3. Toward the school system?
  - 4. Toward the communicator?

Step II. Determining the Desired Outcome of Communication

- A. What do we want our audience to know about accountability?
- B. What attitudes do we want our audience to possess?
  - 1. Toward accountability?
  - 2. Toward the school district?
  - 3. Toward the communicator?
- C. Are there any specific actions we want our audience members to take?
  - 1. Inform others?
  - 2. Support school bond issues?
  - 3. Other possible actions?

Step III. Selecting the Communication Setting

- A. Will we meet our audience in an interpersonal setting?
  - 1. In school?
  - 2. With others present?
- B. Will we meet our audience in a group setting?
- C. Will we have to make use of mass media?
  - 1. Letters, posters, charts, etc.?
  - 2. Radio, television, newspapers?

WORK SHEET

Below are provided spaces for determining exactly what communication objectives you are interested in. After attempting to answer each of the questions on the prior sheet, turn to a work sheet. Utilize a single sheet for each audience. After answering each of the questions, the final space should allow you to write a short, relatively specific communication objective for that audience.

A. Nature of the Audience

B. Desired Outcomes

C. The Communication Setting

D. The Communication Objective

APPENDIX B

Communication Objectives - Work Sheets

Prepared by Gull Lake Participants

Richland Elementary School

WORK SHEET

Below are provided spaces for determining exactly what communication objectives you are interested in. After attempting to answer each of the questions on the prior sheet, turn to a work sheet. Utilize a single sheet for each audience. After answering each of the questions, the final space should allow you to write a short, relatively specific communication objective for that audience.

A. Nature of the Audience

Building Staff - Kdg. thru 3
15 people
Limited knowledge of assessment and accountability
Skeptical and perhaps frightened of assessment and accountability
Good attitude toward system and communicator

B. Desired Outcomes

Know results of this year's Fourth Grade assessment test scores so that an attitude of understand can be developed rather than one of fear and perhaps "hate." Understand communicator is ready to move in developing a positive understanding.

C. The Communication Setting

Informal gathering of group involved.

D. The Communication Objective

Realization that results can be useful to use as a staff (team) in adapting our approach to the teaching of Mathematics and Reading.

Richland Elementary School

WORK SHEET

Below are provided spaces for determining exactly what communication objectives you are interested in. After attempting to answer each of the questions on the prior sheet, turn to a work sheet. Utilize a single sheet for each audience. After answering each of the questions, the final space should allow you to write a short, relatively specific communication objective for that audience.

A. Nature of the Audience

Building Staff - Kdg.-3
15 people
Increased knowledge of assessment and accountability
Better understanding (hopefully) of assessment and accountability
Good attitude toward school system and communicator

B. Desired Outcomes

Realize we are teaching "skills" that are included on the Reading section of assessment test, however, they may differ in substance. Know that communicator will make available materials to determine our skills.

C. The Communication Setting

Informal meeting of staff

D. The Communication Objective

Compare and evaluate our skills with those on assessment test and start "plugging in" supportive skills where we differ in content of skill.

Wildermuth Elementary School

WORK SHEET

Below are provided spaces for determining exactly what communication objectives you are interested in. After attempting to answer each of the questions on the prior sheet, turn to a work sheet. Utilize a single sheet for each audience. After answering each of the questions, the final space should allow you to write a short, relatively specific communication objective for that audience.

A. Nature of the Audience

Kindergarten through 3rd Grade teachers and reading support teacher.

B. Desired Outcomes

To foster positive attitudes for the assessment program.
To reduce apprehensions.
To develop high interest to become knowledgeable in interpretation of the results from the October, 1974 assessment testing.

C. The Communicating Setting

Informal round-table gathering.

D. The Communication Objective

Given available testing data and an opportunity to orally review the recently shown film, the teachers will become less apprehensive, will be able to answer specific questions concerning the test results, and will desire to investigate and to discuss further individual, building, district and state results and our reading and math goals.

Wildermuth Elementary School

WORK SHEET

Below are provided spaces for determining exactly what communication objectives you are interested in. After attempting to answer each of the questions on the prior sheet, turn to a work sheet. Utilize a single sheet for each audience. After answering each of the questions, the final space should allow you to write a short, relatively specific communication objective for that audience.

A. Nature of the Audience

1 - 3 teachers meeting individually with principal.

B. Desired Outcomes

To be able to use the terminology.
To have confidence in interpreting testing results.
To develop a goal for further study, comparing, and evaluating assessment tests, standardized tests with regard to our present programs.

C. The Communication Setting

Round table informal discussion and study.

D. The Communication Objective

Given available data and an opportunity to study and evaluate results, the teacher of third, second, and first grades will become more comfortable to discuss and interpret testing programs and will develop a goal to study the assessment results, standardized testing achievements, and our district reading and math objectives particularly for her level.

WORK SHEET

Below are provided spaces for determining exactly what communication objectives you are interested in. After attempting to answer each of the questions on the prior sheet, turn to a work sheet. Utilize a single sheet for each audience. After answering each of the questions, the final space should allow you to write a short, relatively specific communication objective for that audience.

A. Nature of the Audience

Three Kellogg 4th grade teachers with principal and Curriculum Consultant

B. Desired Outcomes

To impart knowledge of '73 State Assessment Tests
To give results of Kellogg tests
To compare Kellogg tests to the building composite, Gull Lake composite and State results
To recognize areas of strength and weakness in class and individual reports
To plan program and teaching strategies to better meet goals
To give opportunity to answer staff questions re educational assessment

C. The Communication Setting

Interpersonal with three 4th grade teachers

Two meetings with an evaluation meeting at the end of the year

D. The Communication Objective

By the end of the first session, after viewing the State Dept. of Education film, the teachers will better understand the reporting of the results of the new objective referenced tests given to the 4th graders in Oct. 1973.

Using the information provided by the Test Dept. the teachers will use the information from the class summary, individual records and building summary to see the strengths and weaknesses of Kellogg children in general and individual children in particular.

By discussion, followed by a two to four part questionnaire, to determine if teachers understand objectives of meeting and how to interpret objective referenced tests, score details, objective code, work relationships, classroom listing report, etc.

WORK SHEET

Below are provided spaces for determining exactly what communication objectives you are interested in. After attempting to answer each of the questions on the prior sheet, turn to a work sheet. Utilize a single sheet for each audience.

A. Nature of the Audience

Three 4th grade teachers (continued)

B. Desired Outcomes

C. The Communication Setting

D. The Communication Objective

By the second meeting the teachers will go over their assessment tests and based on these bring a needs assessment of their individual children and class based on the State Assessment test and Stanford Achievement scores in Math and Reading.

At this same meeting to share info on teaching strategies and materials to better meet the needs assessment of the 4th grade pupils in our building.

To set up suggested behavioral changes and performance gains for teachers and pupils for balance of year with an evaluation by each teacher at the end of the year plus testing as to whether or not these objectives are met partially, mostly or completely.

WORK SHEET

Below are provided spaces for determining exactly what communication objectives you are interested in. After attempting to answer each of the questions on the prior sheet, turn to a work sheet. Utilize a single sheet for each audience. After answering each of the questions, the final space should allow you to write a short, relatively specific communication objective for that audience.

A. Nature of the Audience

18 Kellogg classroom teachers plus supporting staff (Speech, reading, resource, art, music, p.e., student teachers) with principal

B. Desired Outcomes

To increase understanding of the 1973 Assessment Tests
To give the Kellogg results with interpretation to increase knowledge
To help teachers recognize the areas of strength and weakness in meeting minimal state objectives
To give staff chance to ask questions to clear up apprehension about assessment (accountability)
To review building objectives and teaching strategies to improve performance in future

C. The Communication Setting

Face to face with total staff--Principal and 4th grade teachers

D. The Communication Objective

To introduce entire staff to new objective referenced test by showing State Dept. film on 1973 assessment

To provide staff with information on the Kellogg summary of 4th grade test results for Oct. 1974.

To provide a 2-4 part evaluation sheet at end of the session which will assess if above objectives were met and understood by teachers.

Kellogg Elementary

WORK SHEET

Below are provided spaces for determining exactly what communication objectives you are interested in. After attempting to answer each of the questions on the prior sheet, turn to a work sheet. Utilize a single sheet for each audience. After answering each of the questions, the final space should allow you to write a short, relatively specific communication objective for that audience.

A. Nature of the Audience

Classroom teachers and supportive staff (continued)

B. Desired Outcomes

C. The Communication Setting

D. The Communication Objective

To set up some behavioral changes and performance objectives to improve education in reading and math in K-3 in a follow up meeting within a month. These will be evaluated later in the year, with a follow-up after fall testing.

Kellogg Elementary

WORK SHEET

Below are provided spaces for determining exactly what communication objective you are interested in. After attempting to answer each of the questions on the prior sheet, turn to a work sheet. Utilize a single sheet for each audience. After answering each of the questions, the final space should allow you to write a short, relatively specific communication objective for that audience.

A. Nature of the Audience

Kellogg P.T.A. parents with special invitation to 4th grade parents and teachers

B. Desired Outcomes

To help the parents understand the 1973 State Assessment testing
To encourage parents to have a supportive role toward the assessment program
To give opportunity for questions and discussion so people go home with a better understanding and interest

C. The Communication Setting

Face to Face with probably 50 parents/teachers

D. The Communication Objective

To inform the parents of the make-up of the Michigan Assessment Test and how the scores are reported to the school.
To help the parents understand the results of the Kellogg and Gull Lake tests and what staff is doing to determine needs.

(Discussion and questions will provide feedback as to product of meeting.)

Gull Lake Intermediate School

WORK SHEET

Below are provided spaces for determining exactly what communication objectives you are interested in. After attempting to answer each of the questions on the prior sheet, turn to a work sheet. Utilize a single sheet for each audience. After answering each of the questions, the final space should allow you to write a short, relatively specific communication objective for that audience.

A. Nature of the Audience

4th Grade Teachers at Gull Lake Intermediate School.

B. Desired Outcomes

To assess the objectives each child did not get correct on the Michigan Assessment Test.

C. The Communication Setting

Small group setting.

D. The Communication Objective

Given the results of the Michigan Assessment Test, the teachers will identify the objectives each child received incorrect and to develop program to help these students.

Gull Lake Intermediate School

WORK SHEET

Below are provided spaces for determining exactly what communication objectives you are interested in. After attempting to answer each of the questions on the prior sheet, turn to a work sheet. Utilize a single sheet for each audience. After answering each of the questions, the final space should allow you to write a short, relatively specific communication objective for that audience.

A. Nature of the Audience

5th and 6th Grade Teachers

B. Desired Outcomes

To assess the areas of weakness in the math and reading curriculum

C. The Communication Setting

Small group setting.

D. The Communication Objective

Given the results of the Michigan Assessment Test (4th and 7th grades) the teachers will assess the weak areas in the math and reading curriculum according to this test.

Bedford Elementary School

WORK SHEET

Below are provided spaces for determining exactly what communication objectives you are interested in. After attempting to answer each of the questions on the prior sheet, turn to a work sheet. Utilize a single sheet for each audience. After answering each of the questions, the final space should allow you to write a short, relatively specific communication objective for that audience.

A. Nature of the Audience

Professional Staff, classroom teachers and specials.

B. Desired Outcomes

Communication to parents on assessment results by staff toward a favorable attitude and understanding of test objectives.

C. The Communication Setting

Staff meeting in school 3:10

D. The Communication Objective

Staff to be able to communicate information on assessment tests to parents via parent teacher conferences.

COMMUNICATION OBJECTIVES

Middle School

1. To make Staff knowledgeable of state assessment test results as indicated by correct verbal response to pertinent questions about specific parts of the test summaries.

2. To enable teachers to evaluate and interpret test results as indicated by teachers correctly interpreting specific items and suggesting ways of implementing classroom instructional techniques.

3. To train teachers to communicate test results to interested parents as indicated by teachers giving verbal demonstrations to indicate their ability to do so.

4. To train teachers to make use of the test items to evaluate and improve their programs as indicated by questioning teachers one month after the presentation to determine how much use was made of the assessment test results.

WORK SHEET

Below are provided spaces for determining exactly what communication objectives you are interested in. After attempting to answer each of the questions on the prior sheet, turn to a work sheet. Utilize a single sheet for each audience. After answering each of the questions, the final space should allow you to write a short, relatively specific communication objective for that audience.

A. Nature of the Audience

B. Desired Outcomes

C. The Communication Setting

D. The Communication Objective

Given a presentation on the Michigan Assessment Program, the high school staff will better understand the program as observed by the high school principal.

WORK SHEET

Below are provided spaces for determining exactly what communication objectives you are interested in. After attempting to answer each of the questions on the prior sheet, turn to a work sheet. Utilize a single sheet for each audience. After answering each of the questions, the final space should allow you to write a short, relatively specific communication objective for that audience.

A. Nature of the Audience

Seven man Board of Education

B. Desired Outcomes

The Board of Education will be able to take a position on what we should be expecting from Michigan Assessment.

C. The Communication Setting

A small group setting at the Administration Building.

D. The Communication Objective

Given information on our results of the Michigan Assessment Test, the Board of Education will be able to take a position on what results the Gull Lake Schools should expect from the Michigan Assessment Test in the future.

WORK SHEET

Below are provided spaces for determining exactly what communication objectives you are interested in. After attempting to answer each of the questions on the prior sheet, turn to a work sheet. Utilize a single sheet for each audience. After answering each of the questions, the final space should allow you to write a short, relatively specific communication objective for that audience.

A. Nature of the Audience

Seven man Board of Education

B. Desired Outcomes

To know if the assessment test assesses what is actually taught in our present curriculum.

C. The Communication Setting

A small group setting at the Administration Building.

D. The Communication Objective

Given information of our curriculum along with the objectives tested on the Michigan Assessment test, the Board of Education will be able to determine whether our curriculum stressed the objectives on the assessment test.

APPENDIX C

Participant Feedback Forms

Date: _____

WORKSHOP FEEDBACK FORM

(2nd Training Session)

Please complete this brief feedback form before you leave the meeting today. Be as candid as possible in your remarks. Do not sign your name to this form.

1. As you understand them, what were the objectives of today's seminar?

2. To what degree did you find today's discussion of the Michigan Educational Assessment Program to be of worth to you?

5 4 3 2 1

Very Worthwhile — Of Little Worth

3. To what degree did you find today's discussion of the evaluation of the effectiveness of communication to be of worth to you?

5 4 3 2 1

Very Worthwhile — Of Little Worth

4. Do you feel the speakers did an acceptable job of presenting the material in today's seminar?

_____ a) Yes _____ b) So-So _____ c) No

5. In the space below, please describe what you understand to be your "assignment" for the next session.

6. On the reverse side, please make any other comments you wish to make about the direction of the total project or today's session.

Date: _____

WORKSHOP FEEDBACK FORM

(1st Training Session)

Please complete this brief feedback form before you leave the meeting today. Be as candid as possible in your remarks. Do not sign your name to this form.

1. As you understand them, what are the goals of this cooperative project between the Michigan Department of Education and the Gull Lake Community Schools?

2. As you understand them, what were the objectives of today's seminar?

3. What is your overall impression of the potential worth of this project to your school operations?

5	4	3	2	1
Great Potential Worth				Little Potential Worth

4. To what degree did you find today's seminar to be of worth to you?

5	4	3	2	1
Very Worthwhile				Of Little Worth

5. Do you feel the speakers did an acceptable job of presenting the material in today's seminar?

_____ a) Yes _____ b) So-So _____ c) No

6. On the reverse side, please make any other comments you wish to make about the total project or today's session. Your constructive suggestions would be appreciated.

APPENDIX D

Participant feedback information collected at end of Project

Date: _____

GULL LAKE PROJECT FINAL EVALUATION FORM

Please complete this form anonymously and return to Bob Schinderle.

1. In your own words, define a "communication objective" and its usefulness to you.

2. What are some advantages and disadvantages of small group discussions vs a written report or newsletter in communicating Gull Lake's assessment results to parents?

3. What are some typical communication barriers which may occur as you attempt to relate assessment results to your board of education?

4. Name four audiences for which a Gull Lake elementary principal should prepare distinctly different communication objectives and procedures to relate information about the state assessment program.

5. Why is it important to evaluate communication efforts?

6. What might be a good way for an elementary principal to evaluate whether or not his 4th grade teachers understand the assessment report forms?

7. Assume that the superintendent intends to make a presentation to a PTA meeting on state assessment results for Gull Lake. How might he evaluate his presentation?

GULL LAKE PROJECT FINAL EVALUATION FORM

Please complete this form anonymously and return to Bob Schinderle.

1. For Able Elementary School (4th grade) what percentage of pupils attained math objectives AR-I-B-45?

2. For Able Elementary School (4th grade) what is the "short title" of math objective number 25?

3. For Able Elementary School (4th grade) what percentage of students got 3 answers correct on math objective number 18?

4. For Able Elementary School (4th grade), how many students took the math test?

5. For student John Roberts, was math question 120 correct or wrong?

7. For student John Roberts, how many questions for math objective 12 were answered correctly?

8. What symbol is used on the student report form for an omitted question?

9. What answer "Foil" did John Roberts select for reading question number 200?

10. In the Word Relationship's test, John Roberts scored higher than what percentage of Michigan students?

A → PUPIL NAME: ROBERTS JOHN SCHOOL: CENTRAL ELEM

TEACHER: ANDERSON DISTRICT: ANYTOWN

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
1973-74 (YEAR 5)

GRADE 4

B → MATHEMATICS

C → OBJECTIVE DESCRIPTION

D → OBJECTIVE ATTAINED?

E → ITEM NUMBERS AND RESPONSES BY OBJECTIVE

F → NUMBER CORRECT

OBJECTIVE NO.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35
OBJECTIVE ATTAINED?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
ITEM NUMBERS AND RESPONSES BY OBJECTIVE	96	91	116	106	101	126	131	161	36	71	56	12	61	31	171	81	61	46	51	76	136	21	1	146	6	141	26	31	151	156	111	176	166	86	16
	+	+	A	+	C	F	+	+	+	D	+	C	D	+	+	+	G	+	+	+	F	G	F	+	+	+	D	+	B	B	+	+	H	G	D
	97	92	117	107	102	127	132	162	37	72	57	122	67	42	172	82	62	47	52	77	137	22	2	147	7	142	27	32	152	157	112	177	167	87	17
	+	+	+	+	J	A	+	H	+	F	G	H	C	+	G	+	A	+	+	+	+	D	B	+	G	+	F	F	H	G	+	H	B	D	J
	98	93	118	108	103	128	133	163	38	73	58	123	66	43	173	83	63	48	53	78	138	23	3	148	8	143	28	33	153	158	113	178	168	88	18
	+	C	+	+	A	∴	+	C	+	C	+	A	B	+	C	+	F	B	+	+	+	A	H	+	B	+	C	+	B	A	+	F	G	+	A
	99	94	119	109	104	129	134	164	39	74	59	124	69	44	174	84	64	49	54	79	139	24	4	149	9	144	29	34	154	159	114	179	169	89	19
	+	+	+	+	H	∴	+	J	+	H	H	G	F	+	+	+	+	+	+	G	+	J	B	+	H	+	J	+	G	F	+	A	D	B	G
	100	95	120	110	105	130	135	165	40	75	60	125	70	45	175	85	65	50	55	80	140	25	5	150	10	145	30	35	155	160	115	180	170	90	20
	+	+	+	+	D	∴	+	D	+	B	C	∴	D	+	+	+	J	+	+	+	+	A	J	+	C	+	+	+	C	C	+	+	F	J	C
NUMBER CORRECT	5	4	4	5	0	0	5	1	5	0	2	0	0	5	3	5	1	4	5	4	4	0	0	5	1	5	1	4	0	0	5	2	0	1	0

I → READING

OBJECTIVE DESCRIPTION

OBJECTIVE ATTAINED?

ITEM NUMBERS AND RESPONSES BY OBJECTIVE

NUMBER CORRECT

OBJECTIVE NO.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
OBJECTIVE ATTAINED?	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
ITEM NUMBERS AND RESPONSES BY OBJECTIVE	222	209	191	264	182	11	195	231	192	212	188	215	214	213	181	220	269	190	189	201	266	193	218
	D	+	+	+	G	+	+	+	F	G	F	+	+	+	D	+	B	B	+	+	H	G	D
	227	240	192	265	183	12	196	232	236	229	214	238	221	230	187	224	270	216	219	232	267	194	222
	J	+	G	+	A	+	+	+	+	D	B	+	G	+	F	F	H	G	+	H	F	D	J
	249	241	259	266	184	13	197	233	237	250	226	260	247	248	200	251	271	225	246	203	268	279	223
	B	+	C	+	F	B	+	+	+	A	H	+	B	+	C	+	B	A	+	F	G	+	A
	254	247	215	267	185	14	198	234	253	276	245	278	254	256	244	250	272	279	262	204	209	255	257
	F	+	+	+	+	∴	G	+	J	B	+	H	+	J	+	G	F	+	A	D	B	G
	286	243	262	268	186	15	199	235	277	281	274	283	280	285	263	287	273	284	290	205	210	286	289
	D	+	+	+	J	+	+	+	+	A	J	+	C	+	+	+	C	C	+	+	F	J	C
NUMBER CORRECT	0	5	3	5	1	4	5	4	4	0	0	5	1	5	1	4	0	0	5	2	0	1	0

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT REPORT FORM

G →

WORD RELATIONSHIPS

RAW SCORE: 23 STANDARD SCORE: 47 PERCENT BELOW: 52

DATE OF TESTING: 10/73 CHRONOLOGICAL AGE: 9-11

H →

COMMENTS:

FIGURE 1: THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT REPORT FORM

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FIGURE 1: THE SCHOOL SUMMARY FORM

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM 1973-74 (YEAR 5)

SCHOOL SUMMARY

DISTRICT: MICHVILLE
CODE: 92-010

A → SCHOOL: ABLE ELEM
CODE: 1120

GRADE: FOUR

DATE TESTED: 10/73

CLASSROOM, SCHOOL AND DISTRICT SUMMARY FORM

STAND SCORE INTERVAL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT IN INTERVAL
70-74	0	0
65-69	1	3
60-64	0	0
50-54	2	6
55-59	4	12
45-49	7	21
40-44	6	18
35-39	[illegible]	[illegible]
30-34	3	10
25-29	3	9
20-24	2	6
15-19	1	3
33	NUMBER OF PUPILS	

*** * * * * HUMAN AND FINANCIAL RESOURCE INFORMATION * * * ***

*** * * HUMAN RESOURCES * * ***

53.3	PROFESSIONAL INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF PER 1000 PUPILS
49.2	TEACHERS PER 1000 PUPILS
5.3	AVERAGE YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE
14.3%	PERCENT OF TEACHERS WITH MASTERS DEGREE OR ABOVE
$8,955	AVERAGE CONTRACTED SALARY PER TEACHER

*** * * PERCENT MINORITY * * *** ← I

5.3%	PERCENT OF RACIAL-ETHNIC MINORITY STUDENTS

*** * * SIZE MEASURES * * ***

30	GRADE 4 MEMBERSHIP
152	TOTAL MEMBERSHIP

← H

PERCENT OF STUDENTS ANSWERING						SAMPLE GRADE	NUMBER OF PUPILS	OBJ NO	OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE CODE
									*** * * * * * MATHEMATICS * * * * * ***	
6	9	15	27	33	9	42	33	1	INDICATE OBJECTS THAT ARE SAME SIZE	AR-I-A-6
0	6	12	24	42	15	57	33	2	INDICATE SIMILAR GEOMETRIC SHAPES	AR-I-A-8
0	3	9	12	45	30	84	33	3	INDICATE OBJECTS ARRANGED FULL TO EMPTY	AR-I-A-16
3	15	9	15	30	27	57	33	4	INDICATE LONGEST AND SHORTEST OBJECTS	AR-I-A-24
0	0	0	3	15	81	96	33	5	INDICATE FIRST AND LAST	AR-I-A-40
6	12	9	27	24	21	45	33	6	CHOOSE EQUIVALENT SETS	AR-I-B-7 ← G
3	0	0	12	45	39	84	33	7	CHOOSE SETS HAVING FEWER NUMBERS	AR-I-B-32
81	12	3	0	33	0	3	33	8	INDICATE APPROPRIATE NUMERAL FOR POINT OR A LINE	AR-I-B-40
48	18	12	9	6	6	12	33	9	CHOOSE GREATEST AND LEAST NUMBER	AR-I-B-43
15	12	15	9	21	27	48	33	10	CHOOSE NUMBER BETWEEN TWO NUMBERS	AR-I-B-44
0	3	0	12	45	39	84	33	11	CHOOSE NUMBER BEFORE OR AFTER A NUMBER	AR-I-B-45
3	15	9	15	30	27	57	33	12	IDENTIFY A NUMERAL LESS THAN A 100	AR-I-B-64
0	0	0	3	15	81	96	33	13	INDICATE NUMBER BEFORE OR AFTER NUMBER WITHIN A DECADE	AR-I-B-65
6	12	9	27	24	21	45	33	14	INDICATE WHICH OF 2 NUMBERS IS GREATER OR LESS	AR-I-B-67
3	0	0	12	45	39	84	33	15	INDICATE THE VALUES OF A SET OF DIMES AND PENNIES	AR-I-B-70
81	12	3	0	33	0	3	33	16	IDENTIFY CORRECT EXPANDED NOTATION	AR-I-B-79
48	18	12	9	6	6	12	33	17	CHOOSE LIST OF NUMBERS IN ASCENDING ORDER	AR-I-B-81
15	12	15	9	21	27	48	33	18	INDICATE GREATER OR LESS/ SCRAMBLED POSITIONS	AR-I-B-82

6	9	15	27	33	9	42	33	19	INDICATE NEXT NUMBER IN A SEQUENCE	AR-I-B-84
0	6	12	24	42	15	57	33	20	INDICATE A NUMBER THAT IS A MULTIPLE OF 2	AR-I-B-85
0	3	0	12	45	39	84	33	21	SELECT SET WITH TWICE AS MANY NUMBERS AS ANOTHER	AR-I-B-86
3	15	9	15	30	27	57	33	22	ADD TWO-DIGIT AND ONE-DIGIT NUMBER/NO CARRYING	AR-II-A-10
0	0	0	3	15	81	96	33	23	IDENTIFY OPERATION AND SUM OR DIFFERENCE / NO BORROWING	AR-II-B-6
6	12	9	27	24	21	45	33	24	NUMBER SENTENCES / SUBTRACTION	AR-II-B-9
3	0	0	12	45	39	84	33	25	NUMBER SENTENCES / ADDITION OR SUBTRACTION-IDENTIFY OPERATION	AR-II-B-11
81	12	3	0	33	0	3	33	26	NUMERICAL SET COMPARISONS	AR-II-B-13
48	18	12	9	6	6	12	33	27	SUBTRACT ONE-DIGIT FROM TWO-DIGIT NUMBER / NO BORROWING	AR-II-B-15
15	12	15	9	21	27	48	33	28	SUBTRACT TWO-DIGIT FROM TWO-DIGIT NUMBER / NO BORROWING	AR-II-B-16

OPEN-ENDED EVALUATION QUESTIONS

(Final Project Evaluation)

1) In your opinion, has this experience been worthwhile?

a) Yes, it has helped me understand the material better. It has made me dig for information.

b) Very much so, I think the project brought the principals together to work on a problem. The project helped to identify areas that may have given us problems in communications and to work directly with them.

c) Yes, it has given me personally a broader understanding of the assessment program. Some questions or doubts have been answered or cleared up. It has given me a more positive attitude toward the whole idea.

d) Yes, because it built up my confidence in my ability to communicate information to my staff, and to have a basis for that information.

e) Yes, as the neetings have beeter equipped me to communicate more clearly and hopefully more effectively with my staff. I feel the same would be true with parents.

f) I feel this experience has been worthwhile since it forced us to take a look at the assessment test results in a different way than we might have done. I think it has given us a more positive attitude toward the assessment test.

g) This instructional experience has been very worthwhile for me from the standpoint that it has made me much more aware of the various aspects of group communication. It also has made me more knowledgeable of the state assessment test and its various uses as well as weaknesses. It has made me get back to the staff with emphasis on utilization of the test information.

h) Yes! I eagerly found the time (as I was genuinely interested in all facets and knowledge I could obtain from the results) to seek out information to present facts and knowledge of the results to the various groups--K-3 teachers, 4th grade parents as some usually attend the board meetings. Through out meetings I was able to more quickly and in a more knowledgeable way find and interpret the information.

i) Yes, because:

a) I feel I am more knowledgeable.
b) I feel I can help my teachers better understand and use the results.
c) We did a better job on our homework.
d) Enjoyed the sharing with other principals and consultants. (with Central Office personnel back-up
e) Hope will improve instruction in our building with some total involvement, some grade involvement, and some individual teachers needing help.

2) Do you feel that the three consultants did an acceptable job of conducting the project?

a) Yes, the information that each gave was well worth it. I feel we should go on with out meeting with staff, Board of Education, parents, and meet back with you about the 1st of June.

b) The presentations were good and also the backup help.

c) Yes, wish that there could be more time to pursue with the experts what we have started. At least, you have given the impetus.

d) Yes, especially Mr. Fisher who had the knowledge of the objectives of tests and possible fallacies. Also he suggested ways for effective communication, also possible pitfalls.

e) Yes, they were free, willing and able to answer questions concerning me in the area of communications and assessment.

f) Yes, things were explained well, and we were given ample time to ask any questions. Our tasks were clearly stated, and I think the group felt comfortable in expressing their concerns.

g) The consultants did a good job with the presentation. It was interesting and informative as well as flexible when probing questions were asked. It would be wise if all administrative teams for schools throughout the state could be exposed to this team and its material.

h) Yes, the purposes or objectives in mind each time were clearly presented. There was always time for feedback, questions, and help or clarifications.

i) Yes, greatly appreciated Tom's contribution. Like Erwin's explanation and printed materials.

3) Do you feel that you understand the basic elements of communication theory we presented?

a) Yes and no. The time will tell as to what kind of job of communication that I will do.
Thanks again for all the help.

b) After being involved with the first three sessions I could see the value of the presentations and the need for such work in this area.

c) Yes, I believe that aside from the presentation and discussion, very valuable and useful tool in my possession is the booklet <u>Keeping the Public Informed: Accent on Accountability</u>.

d) Yes, because although I feel I can communicate fairly well. A systematic system to organize a communication approach was very valuable.

e) Yes and no. I still feel somewhat "frizzy." Answering the questionnaire will perhaps clear up "things."

f) Yes, I think I knew some of the basic elements of communications before these meetings, but felt I either learned some new elements or had others reinforced.

g) I feel that I understand the material well enough to dig out the information as I need it.

h) Yes, this area would aid us for any time of presentation of any proposal or information. Taking the time to go through this made me more confident and knowledgeable to meet my different publics.

i) Yes, found that going through the suggested steps (work sheets) helped with my building presentation. Booklet was very interesting.